

REMARKS:

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-19. Claims 1-3, 7, 10, 13 and 16-19 are amended herein. No new matter is presented. Thus, claims 1-19 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e):

Claims 3, 5-9 and 13-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,760,745 (Tan).

The Examiner asserts that col. 10, lines 17-60 and col. 17, lines 15-23 and 31-34 of Tan teach the feature of the invention directed to sending a web page to first and second devices indicated as being in the same group relationship. However, Tan is directed to reproduction of customized information to enable a replication server to reproduce the customized information as a customized document. For example, help sessions are setup between a client computer and a customer service representative computer to cause a single HTML document to be reproduced and be displayed on the client computer and the customer service representative computer (see, col. 10, lines 37-60 and col. 8, lines 31-39).

In contrast, the present invention establishes a remote operation between first and second devices by establishing a master-slave communication between first and second devices in accordance with mode of operation set for the first and second devices. For example, as illustrated in FIG. 4 of the present application, connection requests are implemented upon determining whether a mode of operation of a client requesting the connection is set as the slave or master mode (see, also paragraph 50).

Independent claim 3 as amended recites, "a remote operation control unit simultaneously transmitting the processing results to the first control unit and to a second control unit different from the first control unit that is in a group relationship with the first control unit", where "the first control unit operates as a master in a master-slave communication established between the first control unit and the second control unit." Independent claim 7 also recites similar features.

Independent claim 13 recites, receiving a processing request from a first control unit operating as a master in a master-slave communication established between the first control unit and a second control unit" and "simultaneously transmitting the processing results to the first control unit and to the second control unit that is different from the first control unit and is in a group relationship with the first control unit." Independent claims 16-18 also recite similar features.

It is submitted that the independent claims are patentable over Tan.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over Tan. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, claim 5 recites, "the second control unit comprises a plurality of control units" (see also claim 14 reciting similar features). Tan does not teach or suggest these features of claims 5 and 14.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Claims 1, 2, 4, 10, 12 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of Tan, U.S. Patent No. 6,650,747 (Bala) and U.S. Patent No. 5,768,508 (Eikeland).

The Examiner acknowledges that Tan does not teach that the second apparatus is remotely operated by the first apparatus, but relies on Bala as teaching the same. However, the virtual network computing (VNC) software Bala requires access to each station for a customer service representative (CSR) station to monitor a merchant application (see, col. 9, lines 2-15). For example, a call control server (190) communicates with a merchant web server (182) to select, authenticate and control access to merchant information of each of the stations (see, col. 7, lines 44-55).

On the other hand, Eikeland is directed to providing targeted information to a user via a client program downloaded by the user and disables the user's input to cause the user to view the targeted information without interruption (see, col. 3, lines 65 through col. 4, line 3, col. 7, lines 2-6 and FIG. 1).

Independent claims 1 as amended recites, "disabling user operation of the second device and establishing a remote operation relationship between the first device as a master device and the second device as a slave device in a master-slave communication established between the first device and the second device." Claim 1 further recites, "sending the Web page to the first device and to the second device that is in a group relationship with the first device" and "displaying the Web page on a display of the first device and the second device", where "the second device responds to commands of the first device operating as the master device." Claims 2 and 10 recite similar features.

Independent claim 19 recites, "identifying a group affiliation of a first device requesting a connection" and "transmitting a request of the first device to a second device having the group

affiliation of the first device to obtain information on behalf of the first device", where the first device operates in "a master-slave communication established between the first device and the second device."

Tan and Eikeland, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest features recited in each of the independent claims including establishing "a master-slave communication" between devices as recited in independent claims 1, 2, 10 and 19.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, dependent claims 4 and 12 are also patentable over the cited references.

Lastly, on page 12 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner states that since the requested document is transmitted to both first and second client computers, the second client computer is inherently in the receiving group with the first client computer. The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's statement and request that the Examiner produce authority for the statement. Specifically, Applicants submit that the group relationship with respect to remote operations as recited in the claims is not inherent.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 07/12/2006

By: 
Temnit Afework
Registration No. 58,202

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501